

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,919	02/17/2005	Takashi Yamaguchi	09867/0201967/USO	6414
7278 DARBY & DA	7590 07/31/2007 ARBY P.C.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 770			CEGIELNIK, URSZULA M	
Church Street Station New York, NY 10008-0770		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3711	
	•			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			·		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/511,919	YAMAGUCHI, TAKASHI		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
••••	The MAN INC DATE of the control of	Urszula M. Cegielnik	3711		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. & 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.				
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5) <u>□</u> 6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or				
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·		
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachmen	t(s)				
2)	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) cer No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:			

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croteau-Brooks (US Patent No. 6,604,982) in view of Tilbor et al. (US Patent No. 6,024,627).

Croteau-Brooks discloses pair of left and right driven wheels (28); a pair of left and right steered wheels (28), and a steered wheel-supporting mechanism (18) which supports the steered wheels (28) such that each steered wheel can turn around a predetermined steering axis and such that the steered wheels can turn in the same direction in association with each other; the steering axis is inclined (such as at point shown in Figures 6-8) with respect to a vertical direction such that an upper portion of the steering axis is located rearward of a lower portion of the steering axis in a traveling direction.

Croteau-Brooks does not disclose the pair of left and right driven wheels being independently driven by different driving sources; the inclination angle of the steering axis with respect to the vertical direction being in the range of 20 to 40 degrees.

Art Unit: 3711

Tilbor et al. teach a toy vehicle having a pair of left and right driven wheels being independently driven by different driving sources (col. 3, lines 66-67 through col. 4, lines 1-2)..

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the pair of left and right driven wheels being independently driven by different driving sources as taught by Tilbor et al., since such a modification would provide enhanced steering and propulsion.

With regard to the inclination angle of the steering axis with respect to the vertical direction being in the range of 20 to 40 degrees, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the vertical location of the claimed range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 22 May 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that Croteau-Brooks (US Patent No. 6,604,982) does not disclose the steering elements of Applicant's claimed invention, the Examiner submits that the claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation. The term "steered wheels" is directed to wheels that are capable of being steered (i.e. intended use). Furthermore, the term "steered" is not necessarily connotative of the

Art Unit: 3711

wheels being steered by a steering axle. As long as the wheels are capable of being steered, in this case, by the suspension mechanism, then it meets the claim.

In response to Applicant's argument that Croteau-Brooks does not teach right and left driven wheels, the Examiner submits that Croteau-Brooks clearly discloses this limitation, by disclosing the toy vehicles are capable of movement across either smooth or rough terrain.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the left and right steered wheels are naturally steered in a turning direction by a reaction force received from a ground contact surface and the predetermined steering axle for each of the first and right steered wheels having a positive caster angle, a restorative force being generated that urges the wheels to return to a straight-ahead direction, thereby avoiding an excessive turning motion of the left and right steered wheels) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3711

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Urszula M. Cegielnik whose telephone number is 571-272-4420. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 5:45AM-2:15PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene L. Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

umc

EUGENE KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER